

APPLICANT(S): WESTON, Martin et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/520,945

FILED: November 4, 2005

Page 8

### **REMARKS**

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. Claims 22-34 have been allowed. Claims 5-8 and 12-19 have been objected to, and claims 1-4, 9-11, 20 and 21 have been rejected.

Claims 5, 12, 14, 15 and 17 have been amended herein. Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 5-8, 12-19 and 22-34 appear allowable over the prior art. The Examiner stated that claims 22-34 are allowable and that claims 5-8 and 12-19 contain allowable subject matter but are objected to, presumably because they depend from rejected base claims.

Claims 5, 12, 14, 15 and 17 have been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully assert that this amendment does not narrow the scope of claims 5-8 and 12-19. Since claims 5-8 and 12-19 were objected to only as depending upon a rejected claim, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are now also in order for allowance.

### **Remarks to the Title**

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to the Title because it is not descriptive enough. In response, Applicants have amended the title so as to be more clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

APPLICANT(S): WESTON, Martin et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/520,945

FILED: November 4, 2005

Page 9

## CLAIM REJECTIONS

### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by May (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,125). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

As is well established, in order to successfully assert a prima facie case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art document that includes every element and limitation of the claim or claims being rejected.

It should be noted that independent claim 1 requires the steps of “decomposing the video signal into” three frequency bands, that is to say “a low frequency band and at least two high frequency bands”. Moreover, claim 1 requires “carrying out that both recursive and non-recursive processing in each high frequency band”. It is, therefore, clear that the decomposition into frequency bands and the defined processing in each of at least two high frequency bands are integral features of the claim process.

As the Examiner has recognized, May does not explicitly show the decomposition of a video signal into frequency bands. However, the Examiner asserts that two passages in May suggest or imply such a decomposition.

The Examiner refers to May at column 4, lines 20-25 where it is stated that “In one implementation, two such MVPs are used to process the pixel values of the luminance component (“luma”), with the pixels of the chrominance components (“chroma”) bypassed”. However, this passage does not disclose decomposition into frequency bands. Even if the existence of an NTSC decoder is inferred upstream in the signal chain of the processing of May, there is still no anticipation of the present invention. May receives a luma signal, does not decompose that luma signal into frequency bands, and does not apply the processing defined in claim 1 in each of at least two high frequency bands.

The Examiner then refers to May at column 1, lines 25-37 where there is a discussion of the problems faced in for example MPEG compression of noisy video signals. Specific mention is made of the DCT in MPEG compression. However, even if it is inferred from this passage that an MPEG encoder (involving DCT) should be placed downstream in the chain of

APPLICANT(S): WESTON, Martin et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/520,945

FILED: November 4, 2005

Page 10

the noise reducer of May, the present invention is not anticipated. In such a signal chain, the noise reduction of May will still be applied to the video signal (or the luma component) without decomposition, and there would still be no step of carrying out both recursive and non-recursive processing in each of at least two high frequency bands.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of May, whether taken alone or taken in combination with inferred upstream NTSC decoding or downstream MPEG encoding, fails to anticipate claim 1 of the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2, 4, 9-11, 20 and 21 depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 1, and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, 4, 9-11, 20 and 21 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claim 1 and to claims 2, 4, 9-11, 20 and 21 dependent thereon.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over May. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

May does not teach or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claim 1, as discussed above, nor does it teach or suggest all the limitations of dependent claim 3. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that this rejection should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants assert that the pending claims are allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

APPLICANT(S): WESTON, Martin et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/520,945

FILED: November 4, 2005

Page 11

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,



Morey B. Wildes  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 36,968

Dated: December 27, 2010

**Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP**  
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor  
New York, New York 10036  
Tel: (646) 878-0800  
Fax: (646) 878-0801